

REMARKS

Claims 12 and 19-20 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 5-6, 8, 13 and 15 have been amended. Claims 1-11 and 13-18 remain for further consideration. No new matter has been added.

The objections and rejections shall be taken up in the order presented in the Official Action.

3. Claims 1, 10 and 19 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,262,776 to Griffiths (hereinafter “Griffiths”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,236,805 to Sebestyen (hereinafter “Sebestyen”).

CLAIM 1

As amended, claim 1 recites:

“a bit rate converter to selectively recode the compressed video data in response to a bit rate control signal to provide recoded video data;
a video buffer for intermediately storing the recoded video data;
a bus interface that inserts the decompressed audio data and the buffered recoded video data into the corresponding component bit groups, and receives a data sink video characteristic signal and provides a received data sink video characteristics signal; and
a control unit that is connected to the audio buffer and the video buffer, and which specifies and controls the adjustable intermediate storage time of the audio and video buffers, and in response to the received data sink characteristics signal provides the bit rate control signal.” (emphasis added).

As amended, claim 1 states that the bit rate converter receives the bit rate control signal provided by the control unit, to selectively recode the compressed video signal. The control unit receives the received data sink characteristics signal and provides the bit rate control signal. In contrast, referring to FIG. 2 of Griffiths, Griffiths clearly neither discloses nor suggests providing information indicative of the video adapter 48 or the monitor 47 to the multimedia filter graph

module 36. There is no information even flowing from the video adapter 48 or the monitor 47 to the multimedia filter graph module 36. Similarly, a fair and proper reading of Sebestyen indicates that this prior art reference also fails to disclose or suggest the features of claim 1 as amended. Therefore, assuming for the moment without admitting that Griffiths and Sebestyen are properly combinable, even if these references were combined the scope and content of their combined teachings still fails to render obvious the subject matter of claim 1 as amended.

CLAIM 19

Claim 19 has been cancelled.

4. Claims 2, 5, 6, 8 and 12 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Griffiths and Sebestyen and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,121,205 to Ng (hereinafter “Ng”).

It respectfully submitted that this rejection of these dependent claims is now moot since the independent claims associated with these claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein.

5. Claim 3 currently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Griffiths and Sebestyen and in further view of U.S. Patent 5,596,647 to Wakai et al. (hereinafter “Wakai”).

It respectfully submitted that this rejection is now moot since independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein.

6. Claim 4 currently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Griffiths and Sebestyen and in further view of U.S. Published Application 2001/0014207 to Kawamura (hereinafter “Kawamura”).

It respectfully submitted that this rejection is now moot since independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein.

7. Claim 11 currently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Griffiths and Sebestyen and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,695 to Fujii et al. (hereinafter “Fujii”).

It respectfully submitted that this rejection is now moot since independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein.

8. Claims 7 and 9 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Griffiths and Sebestyen and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,025,654 to Roppel (hereinafter “Roppel”).

It respectfully submitted that this rejection is now moot since independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein.

9. Claims 13-18 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Griffiths and Sebestyen in view of Roppel.

CLAIM 13

As amended, claim 13 recites:

“a subscriber data source that transmits audio digital data and compressed digital video data where the bit positions for the audio or video data are collected together in several connected component bit groups to respective subscriber data sinks on the network, where the subscriber data source includes a demultiplexer that separates compressed audio data and compressed video data contained in one compressed source signal and a pre-processing circuit that processes in parallel the separated audio data and the separated video data to provide decompressed audio data and the compressed video data, where a control unit receives a data sink video characteristic signal and provides a received data sink video characteristics signal to a video bit stream converter that processes the compressed video signal in accordance with the data sink video characteristics signal to reduce the bit rate of the compressed video signal and provide a reduced bit rate video signal, where the reduced bit rate video signal and the decompressed audio signal are output to a data sink on the network.” (emphasis added).

As amended, claim 13 states that the video bit rate converter receives the received data sink video characteristics signal provided by the control unit, to reduce the bit rate of the compressed video signal. The control unit receives the data sink video characteristics signal and provides the bit rate control signal. In contrast, referring to FIG. 2 of Griffiths, Griffiths clearly neither discloses nor suggests providing information indicative of the video adapter 48 or the monitor 47 to the multimedia filter graph module 36. There is no information even flowing from the video adapter 48 or the monitor 47 to the multimedia filter graph module 36. Similarly, a fair and proper reading of Sebestyen indicates that this prior art reference also fails to disclose or suggest the features of claim 1 as amended. Therefore, assuming for the moment without admitting that Griffiths, Sebestyen and Roppel are properly combinable, even if these references were combined

the scope and content of their combined teachings still fails to render obvious the subject matter of claim 13 as amended.

10. Claim 20 currently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Griffiths and Sebestyen in further view of Roppel.

Claim 20 has been cancelled.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-11 and 13-18 is respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Patrick J. O'Shea

Patrick J. O'Shea

Reg. No. 35,305

O'Shea Getz P.C.

1500 Main Street, Suite 912

Springfield, MA 01115

(413) 731-3100, Ext. 102